

Theory of Quantum Error Correction for General Noise

Emanuel Knill¹, Raymond Laflamme¹, and Lorenza Viola² *

¹ *Newton Institute, Cambridge, United Kingdom, and*

Los Alamos National Laboratory, MS B265, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

² *d'Arbeloff Laboratory for Information Systems and Technology, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139*

(February 1, 2008)

Quantum error correction protects quantum information against environmental noise. When using qubits, a measure of quality of a code is the maximum number of errors that it is able to correct. We show that a suitable notion of “number of errors” e makes sense for any system in the presence of arbitrary environmental interactions. In fact, the notion is directly related to the lowest order in time with which uncorrectable errors are introduced, and this in turn is derived from a grading of the algebra generated by the interaction operators. As a result, e -error-correcting codes are effective at protecting quantum information without requiring the usual assumptions of independence and lack of correlation. We prove the existence of large codes for both quantum and classical information. By viewing error-correcting codes as subsystems, we relate codes to irreducible representations of certain operator algebras and show that noiseless subsystems are infinite-distance error-correcting codes. An explicit example involving collective interactions is discussed.

One of the main reasons for the robustness of quantum computation [1–4] is the ability to use quantum error-correcting codes [5,6] to maintain information stored in qubits (two-state particles) subject to environmental noise. Quantum error-correcting codes are defined as subspaces of the qubits’ state space with the property that an initial state in this subspace can be recovered if sufficiently few of the qubits have experienced errors. Provided the noise affecting different qubits is independent and not too intense, any quantum information (*i.e.*, state) stored in the subspace can then be regained with high fidelity. This view suffers from several disadvantages. Notably, it is not obvious whether collective errors can also be corrected well, nor is it clear in what sense the information is preserved *before* it is recovered by correcting the errors. In addition, the present theory does not directly lend itself to the application of similar ideas to physical systems that are not canonically decomposable into qubits or are subject to different interaction Hamiltonians.

In this Letter, we overcome the above inconveniences by introducing a general description of arbitrary system-environment couplings in terms of a *graded interaction algebra*. The degree of an operator in this algebra both

determines the temporal order and the extent to which the operator can affect the system, independent of the internal evolution of the environment. In the case of qubits with independent one-qubit interactions, this notion coincides with the usual concepts of “number of errors” or “error weight” used in combinatorial error analysis. We find that the generalization of minimum distance relates to error correction in the usual way and show that, irrespective of the nature of the environmental noise, large codes exist depending solely on the dimension of the linear space of errors of a given order.

Using algebras to classify errors naturally leads to algebraic methods for describing error-correcting codes. The basic idea is to revisit the notion of error-correcting codes as “abstract particles” [7], which are associated with irreducible representations (*irreps*) of operator algebras closed under Hermitian conjugation ($\dagger$ -closed). Accordingly, error-correcting codes can be viewed as *subsystems* (*i.e.* tensor factors of subspaces), which makes it clear where the protected information resides and eliminates the need for error correction except to make the information available in a standard form. This relates general error correction to a trivial example: Suppose that errors affect all but the first qubit. Then information in the first qubit is clearly safe, and the qubit can be regarded as *noiseless*. We show that *noiseless subsystems* not only are identical to infinite-distance error-correcting codes, but they also provide the most general method of noise-free information storage, thereby substantially extending the concept of noiseless subspaces [8,9].

Systems and Noise. Let S be a quantum system with state space $\mathcal{S}$. $\mathcal{S}$ is an N -dimensional Hilbert space. S interacts with the environment B via an interaction Hamiltonian J which can be written in the form

$$J = \sum_i J_i \otimes B_i, \quad (1)$$

where the B_i ’s are linearly independent environment operators. We assume that the internal evolution of B is removed from J by requiring that $\text{tr}(J_i) = 0$ for all i . The internal evolution of S is retained. If desirable, the latter can be absorbed into a rotating frame, at the expense of making the operators J_i explicitly time-dependent. This can be accommodated within the present formalism through appropriate redefinitions of the relevant quantities. Our analysis only depends on the noise-inducing interaction (1) through an overall *noise-strength* parameter given by

*E-mail addresses: knill@lanl.gov; laflamme@lanl.gov; vlorenza@mit.edu

$$\lambda = |J|, \quad (2)$$

where $|X|$ is the maximum eigenvalue of $\sqrt{X^\dagger X}$. The above quantity can be infinite in situations involving infinite-dimensional environments, *e.g.* the modes of an electromagnetic field. In such cases a redefinition of λ is necessary, based on additional information about the initial state and the internal evolution of the environment. Important examples are noise in the Markovian limit and discrete noise given by quantum operations, which will be discussed later.

The second concept we introduce is the *interaction algebra*, which is the algebra $\mathcal{J}$ generated by $\mathcal{J}_1 = \text{span}\{I, J_1, J_2, \dots\}$, I denoting the identity. Thus, elements of $\mathcal{J}$ are linear combinations of products of operators in $\mathcal{J}_1$. The linearly closed set $\mathcal{J}_1$ consists of the operators of *degree* (at most) one. Next define $\mathcal{J}_d = \mathcal{J}_1^d$, the linear span of products of d or less operators in $\mathcal{J}_1$. These are the operators of *degree* d . $\mathcal{J}_1$ is well-defined in the sense that it is independent of the choice of operators B_i , provided that they are linearly independent. Because the interaction Hamiltonian is Hermitian, $\mathcal{J}_1$ is $\dagger$ -closed, implying that $\mathcal{J}_d$ and $\mathcal{J}$ are $\dagger$ -closed.

This general formalism easily translates to qubits and classical error-correction. If S consists of n qubits, then $N = 2^n$, and a *linear* interaction satisfies that each J_i only involves Pauli operators $\sigma_u^{(k)}$ acting on one qubit. Here k is a qubit label, $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and u is one of x, y or z . *Collective* linear interactions involve global operators $J_u = \sum_k \sigma_u^{(k)}$, corresponding to a situation where a single environment couples symmetrically to all qubits [8]. In most discussions of quantum error correction, however, the interaction is assumed to be *independent*, meaning that each qubit interacts with its own environment [7]. Independent interactions are linear. For linear interactions with qubits, $\mathcal{J}_d$ consists of linear combinations of products of at most d Pauli operators. It is worth stressing that the Lie algebra generated by $\mathcal{J}_1$ usually provides little information about higher-order errors. For example, the Lie algebra generated by the linear interactions contains only linear interactions, while the effect of an environment coupled linearly can include any other higher-order operator and is not restricted to the unitary group generated by the Lie algebra. The *classical* error-correction problem is obtained by letting $\mathcal{J}_1$ consist of all linear combinations of products of Pauli operators with at most one σ_x or σ_y and arbitrarily many σ_z 's. Thus, the interaction is completely (phase) decohering, with first-order bit-flip noise. We call this the *classical interaction*.

Minimum Distance and Error Correction. Noise for S can now be analyzed purely in terms of $\mathcal{J}_1$ and λ . By straightforward generalization of the definitions for qubits and independent interactions, we can define a minimum distance d quantum code for S and $\mathcal{J}_1$ as a code that *detects* [10] all errors in $\mathcal{J}_{d-1}$. Recall that a (quantum) code of S is a subspace $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{S}$, which can be defined through the associated projector $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}$. Error E is detected

by $\mathcal{C}$ if the following protocol works: 1. Prepare a state $|\psi\rangle$ in $\mathcal{C}$. 2. Allow error E to occur, so that the new state is $E|\psi\rangle$. 3. Make a measurement to detect whether the state is in $\mathcal{C}$ or in the orthogonal complement; the outcome is either $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}E|\psi\rangle$ or $(I - \Pi_{\mathcal{C}})E|\psi\rangle$. 4. Accept the state in the former case and reject it otherwise. The protocol is correct if accepted states are proportional to the initial state, *i.e.*, formally,

$$\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}E\Pi_{\mathcal{C}} = \alpha_E \Pi_{\mathcal{C}}, \quad (3)$$

for scalars α_E .

In many cases we only need to preserve *classical* information. We define a code to have minimum c -distance d if for all $E, F \in \mathcal{J}_{d-1}$, $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}E\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}F\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}$ commute. This implies that a basis of $\mathcal{C}$ exists, such that the above protocol is correct when restricted to basis elements. We will use the term *c-code* to denote a code intended only for transmission of classical information in some basis. The notion of error detection can be extended to c -codes if a transmission basis is explicitly provided. We say that the c -code $\mathcal{C}$ with orthonormal basis $|c_1\rangle, |c_2\rangle, \dots$ *detects* E if $\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}E\Pi_{\mathcal{C}}$ is diagonal when expressed in this basis, *i.e.* $\langle c_i|E|c_j\rangle = \alpha_i \delta_{i,j}$.

An *e-error-correcting code* permits correction of all errors in $\mathcal{J}_e$, which means that an initial state in the code can be recovered by some fixed quantum operation after an error in $\mathcal{J}_e$ has occurred. Minimum distance is related to error correction in the usual way.

Theorem 1 *A minimum (c -)distance $2e + 1$ code is an e -error-correcting (c -)code.*

Proof. Recall the necessary and sufficient conditions for a code $\mathcal{C}$ to permit correction of the errors in $\mathcal{J}_e$ [7,11]: $\mathcal{C}$ detects the operators in $\mathcal{J}_e^\dagger \mathcal{J}_e$. This condition is also correct for c -codes with a transmission basis. Since $\mathcal{J}_e^\dagger \mathcal{J}_e \subset \mathcal{J}_{2e}$, the result follows. ■

Error Bounds. To make the analysis based on minimum distance and e -error correction useful, it is necessary to show that e -error-correcting codes protect information well. We give a quantitative relationship for the worst-case error as a function of time t .

Theorem 2 *The error amplitude of information protected in an e -error-correcting (c -)code is at most $(\lambda t)^{e+1}/(e+1)!$.*

We defer the proof until after error-correcting codes have been characterized as subsystems. Note that independence from the internal Hamiltonian of the environment implies that even if the latter is subject to arbitrary, adversarial manipulation, the error-correcting code still effectively protects information on a time scale of $O(1/\lambda)$.

Existence of Large Codes. A goal of constructing good error-correcting codes is to maximize the dimension of minimum (c -)distance d codes. The greedy algorithm for constructing good minimum-distance classical codes

works well in the general case. Let $\{E_1 = I, E_2, \dots, E_D\}$ be a basis of $\mathcal{J}_{d-1}$, with dimension D , and let $\lceil x \rceil$ denote the least integer $\geq x$.

Theorem 3 *There exist codes of S with minimum c-distance d of dimension at least $\lceil \frac{N}{D} \rceil$.*

Proof. Minimum c-distance is equivalent to the existence of an orthonormal basis $|c_1\rangle, \dots, |c_k\rangle$ of the c-code such that, for each operator E_l to be detected,

$$\langle c_i | E_l | c_j \rangle = \alpha_{i,l} \delta_{i,j}. \quad (4)$$

The proof greedily constructs such a basis. Let $|c_1\rangle$ be any state of S . Suppose that $|c_1\rangle, \dots, |c_k\rangle$ have been found, fulfilling (4). Choose $|c_{k+1}\rangle$ orthogonal to the vectors $E_i |c_j\rangle$, $i = 1, \dots, D$, $j = 1, \dots, k$. Such a state exists provided that $kD < N$. The new set of $|c_i\rangle$ satisfies (4). Upon continuing until the set cannot be extended, a c-code of dimension at least $\lceil \frac{N}{D} \rceil$ is found. ■

Our best general construction of good codes for *quantum* information is based on finding a subcode of a c-code.

Theorem 4 *There exist minimum distance d codes of S of dimension at least $\lceil \frac{N}{D} \rceil \frac{1}{D+1}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a c-code of S of dimension at least $\lceil \frac{N}{D} \rceil$ with basis $|c_i\rangle$ satisfying (4). Let Y be the set of indices of the basis vectors. To construct a large quantum code, we partition Y into subsets Y_i and seek non-negative coefficients $\beta_{i,j}$, satisfying $\sum_{j \in Y_i} \beta_{i,j} = 1$. Let $|q_i\rangle = \sum_{j \in Y_i} \sqrt{\beta_{i,j}} |c_j\rangle$. Then the orthonormal vectors $|q_i\rangle$ span the desired code provided

$$\langle q_i | E_l | q_j \rangle = \gamma_l \delta_{i,j}, \quad \forall i, j, l. \quad (5)$$

Compute $\gamma_{l,i} = \sum_{j \in Y_i} \beta_{i,j} \alpha_{j,l}$, the $\alpha_{j,l}$'s being given in (4). We need the $\gamma_{l,i}$ to be independent of i . This problem can be cast in terms of a convex sets problem. We need to find as many disjoint subsets of the set of vectors $\vec{\alpha}_j = \{\alpha_{j,l}\}_l$ with the property that their convex closures have a common intersection. Since $\mathcal{J}_{d-1}$ is $\dagger$ -closed, the $\vec{\alpha}_j$ live in a subspace of real dimension D . By invoking a generalization of Radon's Theorem [12], a necessary condition for the existence of at least r such sets is $r(D+1) - D \leq \lceil N/D \rceil$. The result follows. ■

While the result of Thm. 4 is fully general, the proof does not yield a straightforward constructive method. Also, the lower bound on the existence of good codes is sub-optimal for various systems of interest, including qubits with linear interactions, where the achieved rate is well below the best lower bounds known [13]. According to Thms. 3 and 4, the above bounds for minimum distance d codes are found to be less favorable for independent than for collective interactions, both for classical and for quantum information. This reflects the lower

level of complexity of the error process generated by collective interactions.

Subsystems. If a system consists of a number of qubits, the obvious subsystems are the qubits. If the system consists of a number of photon modes, each mode is a subsystem. However, in order to use these modes as qubits, one could choose the two polarization states for a single photon in a mode as the computational basis. The relevant system is then the subspace where each mode is occupied by exactly one photon, and it is in this subspace that we can identify the qubit subsystems. In both examples, subsystems appear as factors (in the tensor product sense) of subspaces of a larger state space. To avoid working with explicit bases and states, it is convenient to resort to a general algebraic definition. We shall characterize a subsystem of S in terms of a subalgebra of operators acting on $\mathcal{S}$ together with an irrep of the subalgebra. This is motivated by the following fundamental result from the representation theory of $\dagger$ -closed operator algebras [14].

Theorem 5 *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a $\dagger$ -closed algebra of operators on S , including the identity. Then S is isomorphic to a direct sum,*

$$S \sim \sum_i \mathcal{C}_i \otimes \mathcal{Z}_i, \quad (6)$$

in such a way that in the representation on the righthand-side, $\mathcal{A} = \sum_i \text{Mat}(\mathcal{C}_i) \otimes I^{(\mathcal{Z}_i)}$ and the commutant of $\mathcal{A}$ is given by $Z(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_i I^{(\mathcal{C}_i)} \otimes \text{Mat}(\mathcal{Z}_i)$.

Here, $\text{Mat}(\mathcal{H})$ denotes the set of all linear operators from $\mathcal{H}$ to itself, while the commutant $Z(\mathcal{A})$ is the space of all operators commuting with $\mathcal{A}$. Formally, each factor $\mathcal{Z}_i$ ($\mathcal{C}_i$) in Thm. 5 defines a *subsystem* of S with associated state space $\mathcal{Z}_i$ ($\mathcal{C}_i$). As a result of the theorem, subsystems are naturally definable in terms of either algebras or their commutants.

Noiseless Subsystems. Consider the interaction algebra $\mathcal{J}$ associated with (1). Since $\mathcal{J}$ is $\dagger$ -closed, the representation of Thm. 5 applies. For each subsystem $\mathcal{Z}_i$, states in $\mathcal{Z}_i$ are completely immune to the interaction, as the interaction operators only act on the co-factor $\mathcal{C}_i$. Thus, $\mathcal{Z}_i$ is a *noiseless subsystem* i.e., a subsystem where information is intrinsically stabilized against the effects of the noise. As remarked above, a trivial example occurs if we are given two qubits, where only the second one is susceptible to noise. In this case, information in the first qubit is canonically maintained with no need for corrective action. Noiseless (or decoherence-free) subspaces [8,9] can be recognized as special cases of the general decomposition (6) for appropriate interaction algebras $\mathcal{J}$. However, relevant situations can be devised, where noiseless subsystems exist in the absence of noiseless subspaces.

Example. Let us consider three qubits A, B, C with collective linear interactions. The interactions are the generators for spatial rotations. As pointed out in [8], no state

of three qubits is invariant under spatial rotations, the minimal implementation of a noiseless subspace requiring $n = 4$ qubits. However, the state space decomposes into one spin- $\frac{3}{2}$ and two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ irreducible subspaces. The two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ components together are representable as the product of two two-state spaces as in Thm. 5, with $\mathcal{J}$ acting only on the first. Thus the second one is a noiseless subsystem. Another method of finding this subsystem is to observe that the commutant $Z(\mathcal{J})$ is non-trivial. In particular, it includes the scalars under spatial rotations,

$$s_1 = \sigma_x^{(A)} \sigma_x^{(B)} + \sigma_y^{(A)} \sigma_y^{(B)} + \sigma_z^{(A)} \sigma_z^{(B)}, \quad (7)$$

$$s_2 = \sigma_x^{(A)} \sigma_x^{(C)} + \sigma_y^{(A)} \sigma_y^{(C)} + \sigma_z^{(A)} \sigma_z^{(C)}, \quad (8)$$

which are generating observables for the noiseless subsystem. Equivalently, the latter is seen to support one of the irreps of the algebra generated by the scalars.

Error-correcting Codes as Subsystems. The traditional view of error-correcting codes involves encoding the information and correcting errors after the information carriers are transmitted through a noisy channel. The concept of noiseless subsystem shows that, for the purposes of information maintenance, it is not necessary to correct errors, insofar as they affect components independent of the system where information is stored. In general, we wish to protect the information against all errors in $\mathcal{J}_e$ for some reasonably large e . Since a subsystem unaffected by the operators in $\mathcal{J}_e$ is automatically noiseless, but in most cases of interest noiseless subsystems do not exist, it is necessary to take an active role in maintaining information. Rather than using error correction to restore the overall state of the system *after* errors happened, we propose to use a quantum operation *before* the latter occur, in such a way that the net effect of the quantum operation followed by errors in $\mathcal{J}_e$ assures preservation of the information in a subsystem. A quantum operation is described by a family $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_i$ of linear operators acting on $\mathcal{S}$, evolving the system density operator as $\rho \mapsto \sum_i A_i \rho A_i^\dagger$. The combined action of the quantum operation, followed by errors in $\mathcal{J}_e$, is represented by the product of an operator $E \in \mathcal{J}_e$ and one of the operators $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$. Consequently, a state of a noiseless subsystem of the $\dagger$ -closed algebra generated by $\mathcal{J}_e \mathcal{A}$ is preserved in this process.

Theorem 6 *Every e -error-correcting code arises as a noiseless subsystem of $\mathcal{J}_e \mathcal{A}$ for some $\mathcal{A}$ with the property that $I \in \text{span}(\mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{A})$. Conversely, every noiseless subsystem of $\mathcal{J}_e \mathcal{A}$ with $\mathcal{A}$ satisfying the above condition corresponds to an e -error-correcting code.*

Proof. The fact that error-correcting codes yield such noiseless subsystems follows from Thm. III.5 of [7] by letting $\mathcal{A}$ consist of operators that return the state of the error system to the state $|\mathcal{E}(0)\rangle$ (in the notation of [7]). Conversely, the condition $I \in \text{span}(\mathcal{A}^\dagger \mathcal{A})$ ensures the existence of a quantum operation whose operators are in $\mathcal{A}$.

Thus, the process suggested earlier protects the information against errors in $\mathcal{J}_e$. Because of the necessity of the conditions for error-correcting codes [7], there exists an associated e -error-correcting code in the usual sense. ■

As a consequence, noiseless subsystems are infinite-distance quantum error-correcting codes.

Error Analysis. We are now ready to give a proof of Thm. 2 based on viewing error-correcting codes as subsystems protected by an initial quantum operation $\mathcal{A}$.

Proof of Thm. 2. By purifying the environment [15], we can assume that the environment's initial state is $|\psi\rangle_B$. The initial state of the system has the intended state in the subsystem associated with the error-correcting code. Again, by purifying and by adding the reference system to S , we can assume that the state is given by $|\phi_0\rangle_{\mathcal{S}}$. The quantum operation $\mathcal{A}$ can be assumed to arise from a unitary evolution U applied to $|\phi_0\rangle_{\mathcal{S}}|0\rangle_A$, where A is an ancillary system. Let $|\phi\rangle = U|\phi_0\rangle_{\mathcal{S}}|0\rangle_A$ and consider the subsequent interaction with the environment over time t . By slicing the interaction time into intervals of duration t/n , the overall evolution up to time t can be written as ($\hbar = 1$)

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{k=1}^n \delta U_k^{(S)} \delta U_k^{(B)} |\phi\rangle |\psi\rangle_B, \quad (9)$$

where $\delta U_k^{(S)}$, $\delta U_k^{(B)}$ denote the unitary evolutions during the k 'th interval due to J and to the environment's internal Hamiltonian respectively. It suffices to consider a first-order expansion $\delta U_k^{(S)} = I - iJ(t/n) + O((t/n)^2)$. The elements contributing noise all involve at least $e + 1$ factors of J . By distributing some of the sums $I - iJt/n$ starting at the first time interval, the expression inside the limit can be thought of as a sum over the branches of a binary tree of products of operators associated with the edges and nodes of the tree [16]. The root node is labeled $\delta U_1^{(B)}$, and its two edges by I and $-iJt/n$ respectively. The two children are labeled by $\delta U_2^{(B)}$, their descendant edges by I and $-iJt/n$ and so on. We choose to terminate a branch at a point where there are $e + 1$ factors of $-iJt/n$ on its path and label the leaf with the remaining product of unitary operators. The total error is estimated by summing the error amplitudes associated with the products along each of these terminated branches. A counting argument shows that there are $\binom{n}{e+1}$ such branches. Using $|CD| \leq |C||D|$ and the fact that unitary operators preserve the amplitude, the error of each such branch is bounded by $(\lambda t/n)^{e+1}$. Thus, the error amplitude is at most $\binom{n}{e+1} (\lambda t/n)^{e+1} \leq (\lambda t)^{e+1} / (e+1)!$. ■

Markovian Noise. As mentioned above, in many cases involving infinite dimensional environments the estimate of Thm. 2 cannot be used without redefining λ . For instance, when the noise is to a good approximation Markovian, the evolution of the system density operator can be written as $\rho \mapsto \rho_t = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_{t/n}^n(\rho)$, where the superoperator $\mathcal{L}_{t/n}$ takes the form $\mathcal{L}_{t/n}(\rho) =$

$\rho + (t/n)(\sum_i L_i \rho L_i^\dagger + V \rho + \rho V^\dagger)$ for a suitable choice of operators L_i and V [17]. Our techniques apply with $\mathcal{J}_1$ given by the linear span of I , these operators and their Hermitian transposes. The bound of Thm. 2 holds provided we replace error amplitude with error probability and redefine λ as

$$\lambda = 2|V| + |L_1|^2 + |L_2|^2 + \dots \quad (10)$$

The need to consider error probability rather than amplitude is due to the statistical nature of Markovian noise.

Theorem 7 *The error probability of information protected in an e -error-correcting (c -)code subjected to Markovian noise is bounded by $(\lambda t)^{e+1}/(e+1)!$.*

Proof. Let ρ be the state of the system after the protecting quantum operation has been applied, and $\rho_t = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_{t/n}^n(\rho)$. If we write $\rho_t = \rho_c + \rho_e$, where ρ_c has no error in the subsystem of interest, then the error probability is bounded by $\text{tr}(\sqrt{\rho_e^\dagger \rho_e})$. The product of n infinitesimal evolutions can be expanded as in the proof of Thm. 2, but replacing unitary operators with trace-preserving superoperators and omitting the environmental contribution. The non-identity terms in the branches are superoperators of the form $\rho'' \mapsto (t/n)(\sum_i L_i \rho'' L_i^\dagger + V \rho'' + \rho'' V^\dagger)$, whose effect can be bounded by the parameter λ given in (10). (Use the fact that if we define $l_1(\rho) = \text{tr}(\sqrt{\rho^\dagger \rho})$, then $l_1(\rho U) \leq l_1(\rho)|U|$.) ■

In the past, error probability has been used in almost all treatments of noise. Therefore, Thm. 7 further connects our formulation of error correction to the usual one. **Discrete Quantum Operations.** A picture of the situation involving qubits coupled to independent environments, which is what has been typically addressed by quantum error-correction theory, is that a known, somewhat noisy quantum operation is applied to each qubit. In this case, time does not play an explicit role. Instead, we are given quantum operations $\mathcal{L}_i$, each expressible in the form $\mathcal{L}_i(\rho) = (I + V_i)\rho(I + V_i^\dagger) + L_{i1}\rho L_{i1}^\dagger + L_{i2}\rho L_{i2}^\dagger + \dots$. The noise operation involves applying each quantum operation to the system in some order. To apply our theory and bounds to this situation, define $\mathcal{J}_1$ as the span of I , the operators V_i , L_{ij} and their Hermitian transposes. The noise-strength parameter can be redefined as $\lambda = \max_i(2|V_i| + |V_i|^2 + \sum_j |L_{ij}|^2)$, so that Thm. 7 applies for $t = 1$. This gives estimates not far from the standard ones in the case of qubits subject to depolarizing noise [10].

Time-Dependent Noise. Time-dependent noise can arise from the use of a rotating frame to compensate for internal evolution of the system, or to compensate for time-dependent control actions, such as the ones exploited in decoupling schemes for open quantum systems [18]. To adapt our theory to this situation, it suffices to maximize the expression of λ over time and choose $\mathcal{J}_1$

as the span of all first-order operators occurring at various times.

Summary. By suitably incorporating the description of the error generation process within a general algebraic setting, we showed how to reformulate quantum error correction without restricting the statistical properties of the environmental noise. The existence of large codes was established for both classical and quantum information, opening the way to accurate quantum computations in the presence of arbitrary errors. In addition to substantially strengthening the power of quantum error-correction theory, our analysis points to the notion of a noiseless subsystem as an emerging unifying framework for quantum information protection. Full exploitation of the above concept should prove fruitful in the general context of quantum information processing.

Acknowledgments. We thank Asher Peres for the three qubit example of a noiseless subsystem. E. K. and R. L. received support from the Department of Energy, under contract W-7405-ENG-36, and from the NSA. L. V. was supported in part by DARPA/ARO under the QUIC initiative.

-
- [1] P. W. Shor. Fault-tolerant quantum computation. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 56–65, Los Alamitos, California, 1996. IEEE press. quant-ph/9605011.
 - [2] D. Aharonov and M. Ben-Or. Fault-tolerant quantum computation with constant error. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, pages 176–188, New York, 1996. ACM Press. quant-ph/9611025.
 - [3] A. Yu. Kitaev. Quantum computations: algorithms and error correction. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk.*, 52:53–112, 1997.
 - [4] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and W. H. Zurek. Resilient quantum computation. *Science*, 279:342–345, 1998.
 - [5] P. W. Shor. Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory. *Physical Review A*, 52:R2493–R2496, 1995.
 - [6] A. Steane. Multiple particle interference and quantum error correction. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A*, 452:2551–2577, 1996.
 - [7] E. Knill and R. Laflamme. A theory of quantum error correcting codes. *Physical Review A*, 55:900–911, 1997.
 - [8] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti. Noiseless Quantum Codes *Physical Review Letters*, 79:3306–3309, 1998. P. Zanardi and F. Rossi. Quantum information in semiconductors: Noiseless encoding in a quantum-dot array. *Physical Review Letters*, 81:4752–4755, 1998.
 - [9] D. A. Lidar, I. L. Chuang, and K. B. Whaley. Decoherence-free subspaces for quantum computation. *Physical Review Letters*, 81:2594–2597, 1998.
 - [10] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters. Mixed state entanglement and quantum error-

- correcting codes. *Physical Review A*, 54:3824–3851, 1996.
- [11] M. A. Nielsen, C. M. Caves, B. Schumacher, and H. Barnum. Information-theoretic approach to quantum error-correction and reversible measurement. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A*, 454:277–304, 1998.
 - [12] H. Tverberg. A generalization of Radon’s theorem. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 41:123–128, 1966.
 - [13] A. R. Calderbank and P. W. Shor. Good quantum error-correcting codes exist. *Physical Review A*, 54:1098–1105, 1996.
 - [14] C. W. Curtis and I. Reiner. *Representation Theory of Finite Groups and Associative Algebras*. Interscience Publishers, Wiley&Sons, 1962.
 - [15] B. Schumacher. Sending entanglement through noisy quantum channels. *Physical Review A*, 54:2614–2628, 1996.
 - [16] C. L. Liu. *Introduction to Combinatorial Mathematics* McGraw-Hill, New York, 1968.
 - [17] R. Alicki and K. Lendi. *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
 - [18] L. Viola and S. Lloyd. Dynamical suppression of decoherence in two-state quantum systems. *Physical Review A*, 58:2733–2744, 1998. L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd. Dynamical decoupling of open quantum systems. *Physical Review Letters*, 82:2417–2421, 1999.